THIS ATTACHMENT INCLUDES TWO SCANNED DOCUMENTS WHICH I HAVE TRIED TO MAKE AREADABLE@ TO USE AS AN ATTACHMENT FOR THE E-MAILED INITIAL BRIEF OF INTERVENOR ACI CORP.

PLEASE SEE THE HARD COPY WHICH HAS BEEN MAILED TO YOU ON TODAY=S DATE FOR ACCURATE ATAB 1" DOCUMENTS.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL

July 8,1999
In reply please refer to:
Docket No. 98-11-10:TE:PAP

J. Vance Hancock, Esquire
Southern New England Telephone Company
310 Orange Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06510

Re: Docket No. 98-11-10, Application of ACl Corporation for an Advisory Ruling on the Southern New England Telephone Company's Provision of Unbundled Loops to Competitive Local Exchange Carriers

Dear Mr. Hancock:

The Department of Public Utility Control (Department) acknowledges receipt of the Southern New England Telephone Company's (Telco) June 10, 1999 proposed xDSL tariff filed in compliance with the May 5,1999 Decision in the above noted docket. According to the filing, the proposed tariff includes three xDSL capable loops: (i) 2-Wire ADSL Capable Loop; (ii) 2-Wire Midband Symmetric (MS) Technology Capable Loop: and (iii) 2-Wire ISDN-DSL (IDSL) Capable Loop.

The Department is also in receipt of ACI Corp's (ACl) June 30, 1999 petition to modify the Telco's proposed xDSL tariff and to make the service offering effective within 15 days on an interim basis subject to a true-up (Petition[)] and MCI WorldCom Inc.'s (MCIW) Petition to Suspend Tariff (MCIW Petition), dated June 30, 1999. ACI objects to the Telco's proposed tariff because the technical conditions and rates contained in the proposed tariff violate both the May 5, 1999 Decision, and the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) March 31, 1999 Decision, in CC Docket No. 98-147, Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability (Advanced Services Order). Specifically, ACl argues that the Telco has imposed unnecessary SBC Communications, Inc. (SBC)-specific technical limitations that would restrict the types of advanced services that competitive local exchange carriers (CLEC) can offer. ACI also argues that the Telco seeks to impose thousands of dollars in unjustified and non-cost based charges for xDSL capable loops. Petition, pp. 4-9. MCIW objects because the proposed tariff fails to comply with the May 5,1999 Decision, and the Telco's proposed line

[)] ACl has included as part of the Petition, a Aredlined@ version of the Telco's proposed xDSL tariff that it believes complies with the May 5,1999 Decision and the FCC's **Advanced Services Order. Petition, p. 11.**

conditioning and qualification charges are excessive, unjustified and contrary to forward-looking costing principles. MCIW also objects because the Telco has improper defined xDSL capable loops and improperly relies on SBC-documentation. Lastly, MCIW objects to the proposed tariff fails to provide CLECs access to prequalification information at the preorder stage. MCIW Petition, pp. 2-7.

The Department has reviewed the Telco=s proposed xDSL tariff, the Petition and MCIW Petition. Based on this review, the Department has determined that both petitions have merit. ACI states that the Telco has filed a tariff Athat is designed to corner both the Department and CLECs into the Hobson's choice of either opposing the tariff, which will result in yet further delay, or allowing the tariff to take effect, which will force CLECs into ordering loops that not only severely limit the services that CLECs can provide, but will make acquiring these loops prohibitively expensive (i.e., thousands of dollars per loop).@ Petition p. 3. The Department agrees and is of the opinion that if the proposed xDSL tariff is approved, the offering of xDSL services in Connecticut by providers other than the Telco will be delayed. Therefore, the Department will require the Telco to submit a revised xDSL tariff that is identical to the redlined version proffered by ACI. The Department will permit, subject to a true-up, the ACI-proposed rates, charges and terms and conditions to go into effect until such time as a permanent xDSL service tariff that is consistent with the May 5,1999 Decision is approved.

Accordingly, no later than July 14, 1999, the Telco is hereby directed to file with the Department a revised xDSL service tariff that is identical to the ACI xDSL tariff.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITY CONTROL

Louise E. Rickard
Acting Executive Secretary

cc: Service List

18.2 Unbundled Network Elements (Cont'd)

18.2.1 Local Loop Elements (Cont'd)

B. 2 Wire ISDN Digital Grade supports digital transmission of two 64 Kbps bearer (AB@) channels and one 16 Kbps data (AD@) channel. This is a 2B + D basic rate Integrated Service Digital Network (BRI-ISDN) type of loop which meets National ISDN standards.

C. 4 Wire DS1 Digital Grade supports full duplex transmission of isochronous serial data at 1.542 Mbps. This is a T-1/DS1 type of loop and provides the equivalent of 24 voice grade/DS0 channels. Available options include Extended Super Frame (ESE) and Clear Channel Signaling capability (B8ZS format).

A. Digital Subscriber Line (xDSL) Capable Loop describes loops which may support various technologies and services. The >x' in xDSL is a placeholder for the various types of DSL services. **An xDSL loop is a plain twisted pair copper loop without load coils, repeaters, or DAMLs, and which may contain minimal bridge tap, of up to 2,500 feet.** The Telephone Company reserves its right to contest whether any xDSL service is subject to the resale and unbundling requirements of federal and state law.

~~The provision of DSL services is subject to a variety of technical constraints, including loop length and the current design of the loop, which must be free of excessive bridged taps, and loading coils. In addition, clear spectral compatability standards and spectrum management rules and practices are necessary to ensure the quality, integrity, and reliability of the Telephone Company=s network and its existing service.~~

To ensure spectral compatability, industry standards bodies such as American National Standards Institute (ANSI), **through its T1E1.4 subcommittee,** have developed or are in the process of developing Power Spectrum Density (PDS) mask standards to enable multiple technologies to coexist within binder groups. **The following national xDSL standards have been approved: T1.601 (Basic Rate ISDN/ISDL), TR28 (HDSL), and T1.413 (ADSL). DSL technologies used on xDSL loops shall comply with national standards if such standards exist.** ~~If multiple national standards exist and are mutually incompatible, the Telephone Company shall select the standard that best fits its existing network. The customer will comply with the Telephone Company=s rules on spectrum compatability and management and will not exceed the power levels specified, or vary from other technical parameters set forth in the applicable standards and specifications.~~

In addition, any DSL technology which has been approved by the FCC or any state commission or which has been successfully deployed by any carrier without significantly degrading the performance of other services is presumed acceptable for deployment. ASignificantly degrade@ is defined as an action that noticeably impairs a service from a user=s perspective. The Department of Public Utility Control shall determine whether a technology significantly degrades the performance of other services.

cc: Service List

cc: Service List

0223705.001 7/28/1999SCHcrs

0223754.001 7/28/1999SCHcrs

cc: Service List